U.S. DISTRICT COURT EASTERN DISTRICT-WI UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FILED EASTERN DISTRICT OF WISCONSING OCT 26 P 3 34

MILWAUKEE ELECTRIC TOOL CORPORATION, METCO BATTERY TECHNOLOGIES LLC, AC (MACAO COMMERCIAL OFFSHORE) LIMITED, and TECHTRONIC INDUSTRIES CO. LTD.,

STEPHEN C. DRIES CLERK SAN DOLL

Case No. 14-CV-1296-JPS

Plaintiffs,

Defendant.

v.

SNAP-ON INCORPORATED,

- 1

SPECIAL VERDICT

We, the jury, duly impaneled and sworn, for our special verdict in the above-entitled action, find as follows:

I. INFRINGEMENT

A. Infringement of the '290 Patent:

Claim 1 of the '290 Patent.

Question 1: Has Milwaukee shown that it is more likely than not that Snap-on's lithium-ion battery packs infringe Claim 1 of the '290 patent? Check "Yes" (finding for Milwaukee) or "No" (finding for Snap-on) with regard to each accused pack. (For the Court's instructions on this question, see Section 2.1 of the Jury Instructions.)

CTB8185	Yes	No
CTB8172	Yes	No

CTB7185	Yes	No
CTB7172	Yes	No
CTB6185	Yes	No
CTB6187	Yes	No
CTB6172	Yes	No

B. Infringement of the '173 Patent:

Claim 1 of the '173 Patent.

Question 2: Has Milwaukee shown that it is more likely than not that Snap-on's lithium-ion battery packs infringe Claim 1 of the '173 patent? Check "Yes" (finding for Milwaukee) or "No" (finding for Snap-on) with regard to each accused pack. (For the Court's instructions on this question, see Section 2.1 of the Jury Instructions.)

CTB8185	Yes	No
CTB8172	Yes	No
CTB7185	Yes	No
CTB7172	Yes	No
CTB6185	Yes	No
CTB6187	Yes	No
CTB6172	Yes	No

Claim 12 of the '173 patent.

Question 3: Has Milwaukee shown that it is more likely than not that Snap-on's power tools and associated battery packs infringe Claim 12 of the '173 patent? Check "Yes" (finding for Milwaukee) or "No" (finding for Snap-on) with regard to each accused pack. (For the Court's instructions on this question, see Section 2.1 of the Jury Instructions.)

CTB8185	Yes	No
CTB8172	Yes	No
CTB7185	Yes	No
CTB7172	Yes	No
CTB6185	Yes	No
CTB6187	Yes	No
CTB6172	Yes	No

C. Infringement of the '510 Patent:

Claim 18 of the '510 Patent.

Question 4: Has Milwaukee shown that it is more likely than not that Snap-on's lithium-ion battery packs infringe Claim 18 of the '510 patent? Check "Yes" (finding for Milwaukee) or "No" (finding for Snap-on) with regard to each accused pack. (For the Court's instructions on this question, see Section 2.1 of the Jury Instructions.)

CTB8185	Yes	No
CTB8172	Yes	No
CTB7185	Yes	No
CTB7172	Yes	No
CTB6185	Yes	No
CTB6187	Yes	No

Dependent Claim 19 of the '510 Patent.

Question 5: Has Milwaukee shown that it is more likely than not that Snap-on's power tools and associated battery packs infringe Claim 19 of the '510 patent? Check "Yes" (finding for Milwaukee) or "No" (finding for

Snap-on) with regard to each accused pack. (For the Court's instructions on this question, see Section 2.1 of the Jury Instructions.)

CTB8185	Yes	No
CTB8172	Yes	No
CTB7185	Yes	No
CTB7172	Yes	No
CTB6185	Yes	No
CTB6187	Yes	No

II. OBVIOUSNESS

Question 6: For each asserted claim of each asserted patent, has Snap-on shown by clear and convincing evidence that the claim would have been obvious to persons having ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention? Check "Yes" (finding for Snap-on) or "No" (finding for Milwaukee). (For the Court's instructions on this question, see Section 2.2 of the Jury Instructions.)

'290 Patent Claim 1:	Yes	No
'173 Patent Claim 1:	Yes	No
'173 Patent Claim 12:	Yes	No
'510 Patent Claim 18:	Yes	No
'510 Patent Claim 19:	Yes	No /

III. WILLFUL INFRINGEMENT (IF APPLICABLE)

If you answered "Yes" with regard to any accused products in any of Questions 1, 2, 3, 4, or 5 and you answered "No" for at least one of the patent claims with regard to Question 6, please answer the following Question 7, otherwise DO NOT ANSWER Question 7. (For the Court's instructions on this question, see Section 2.3 of the Jury Instructions.)

Question 7: Has Milwaukee shown that it is more likely than not that Snap-on's infringement was willful?

IV. DAMAGES (IF APPLICABLE)

If you answered "Yes" with regard to any accused products in any of Questions 1, 2, 3, 4, or 5 and you answered "No" for at least one of the patent claims with regard to Question 6, please answer the following Question 8, otherwise DO NOT ANSWER Question 8. (For the Court's instructions on this question, see Section 2.4 of the Jury Instructions.)

Question 8: What amount has Milwaukee shown it is entitled to as a reasonable royalty?

Reasonable Royalty: \$ 27,800,000.00

Dated at Milwaukee, Wisconsin, this <u>36</u> day of October, 2017.

Foreperson